	Case 2:07-cv-01273-RSL Docum	ment 9 Filed 09/27/07 Page 1 of 5
01		
01		
02		
03		
04		
06		
07	LINITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
08	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
09	MARSHALL O'DAL WILSON,) Case No. C07-1273-RSL
10	Plaintiff,)
11	v.) ORDER DISMISSING CERTAIN
12	KING COUNTY JAIL FACILITY, et al.,	DEFENDANT AND DIRECTING SERVICE BY FIRST CLASS MAIL ON REMAINING DEFENDANTS
13	Defendants.	
14)
15	Plaintiff Marshall O'Dal Wilson, a state inmate, is proceeding pro se and in forma	
16	pauperis in his attempt to bring an amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights claim against	
17	employees of the King County Jail Facility in Kent, Washington, as well as King County Jail	
18	Facility Health Staff, Health Staff Supervisors, and Claims Agent Sandra Courtway. Dkt. No.	
19	8. By order dated August 27, 2007, United States Magistrate Judge James P. Donohue	
20	declined to serve plaintiff's original complaint but granted leave to amend certain specified	
21	deficiencies. Dkt. No. 7. Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint alleges acts and omissions	
22	on the part of King County Jail employees including, but not limited to, allowing a prisoner	
23	who was a known carrier of Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus Aureus ("MRSA") to enter a	
24	common containment area causing plaintiff to become infected with MRSA, and a procedural	
25	due process claim against Claims Agent Sandra Courtway. Dkt. No. 8. After careful	
26	consideration of the amended complaint, supporting materials, governing law and the balance	
	ORDER DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANT AND DIRECTING SERVICE ON REMAINING DEFENDANTS	

of the record, the Court ORDERS as follows:

Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires plaintiffs to submit a complaint "which sets forth . . . a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). In order to state a claim for relief under § 1983, a plaintiff must assert that he suffered a violation of rights protected by the Constitution or created by federal statute, and that the violation was proximately caused by a person acting under color of state law. *See Crumpton v. Gates*, 947 F.2d 1418, 1420 (9th Cir. 1991); *WAX Techs., Inc. v. Miller*, 197 F.3d 367, 372 (9th Cir. 1999) (en banc). This requires the plaintiff to allege facts showing how a specific individual violated a specific right, causing the harm alleged in the plaintiff's complaint. *Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp.*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981).

outlined in this court's August 27, 2007 Order. *See* Dkt. No. 7. Plaintiff has once again named "King County Jail Facility" as a defendant, but does not allege that the harm he suffered was the result of a policy or custom of that facility. A local governmental unit, such as King County, may not be held responsible for the acts of its employees under a *respondeat superior* theory of liability. *See Collins v. City of Harker Heights*, 503 U.S. 115, 121 (1992). Rather, a § 1983 plaintiff must allege facts showing that any constitutional deprivation he suffered was the result of a "policy or custom" of the local governmental unit. *See Board of County Comm'rs v. Brown*, 520 U.S. 397, 403 (1997); *Ortez v. Washington County*, 88 F.3d 804, 811 (9th Cir. 1996); *Navarro v. Block*, 72 F.3d 712, 714-15 (9th Cir. 1996). Plaintiff has not alleged facts showing that he suffered a deprivation of rights due to a policy or custom of the "King County Jail Facility." Accordingly, plaintiff's allegations against the King County Jail fail to state a claim for which relief may be granted and are DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

ORDER DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANT AND DIRECTING SERVICE ON REMAINING DEFENDANTS
PAGE – 2

01

181920212223

17

2526

- (2) Service by Clerk on Remaining Defendants. The Clerk is directed to send defendants (1) Jail Commander John Doe; (2) King County Jail Facility Officers John Doe 1-10 and Jane Doe 1-10; (3) King County Jail Facility Health Staff Jane Doe 1-10; (4) Health Staff Supervisors John Doe 1-5; and (5) Claims Agent Sandra Courtway by first class mail, the following: a copy of plaintiff's complaint and of this Order, two copies of the Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons, a Waiver of Service of Summons, and a return envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to the Clerk's office.
- (3) Response Required. The above-named defendants shall have **thirty** (**30**) **days** within which to return the enclosed Waiver of Service of Summons. Any defendant who timely returns the signed Waiver shall have **sixty** (**60**) **days** after the date designated on the Notice of Lawsuit to file and serve an answer to the Complaint or a motion permitted under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Any defendant who fails to timely return the signed Waiver will be personally served with a summons and Complaint, and may be required to pay the full costs of such service, pursuant to Rule 4(d)(2). A defendant who has been personally served shall file an answer or motion permitted under Rule 12 within **thirty (30) days** after service.

before this Court are required to file documents electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system. Counsel are directed to the Court's website, www.wawd.uscourts.gov, for a detailed description of the requirements for filing via CM/ECF. All non-attorneys, such as *pro se* parties and/or prisoners, may continue to file a paper original of any document for the Court's consideration. A party filing a paper original does not need to file a chambers copy. All filings, whether filed electronically or in traditional paper format, must indicate in the upper right hand corner the name of the Judge to whom the document is directed.

Additionally, any document filed with the Court must be accompanied by proof that it has been served upon all parties that have entered a notice of appearance in the underlying

)1 || matter.

(5) <u>Motions</u>. Any request for court action shall be set forth in a motion, properly filed and served. Pursuant to amended Local Rule CR 7(b), any argument being offered in support of a motion shall be submitted as a part of the motion itself and not in a separate document. The motion shall include in its caption (immediately below the title of the motion) a designation of the date the motion is to be noted for consideration upon the court's motion calendar.

Stipulated and agreed motions, motions to file overlength motions or briefs, motions for reconsideration, joint submissions pursuant to the option procedure established in Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(B), motions for default, requests for the clerk to enter default judgment, and motions for the court to enter default judgment where the opposing party has not appeared shall be noted for consideration the same day they are filed. *See* Local Rule CR 7(d)(1). All other non-dispositive motions shall be noted for consideration no earlier than the third Friday following filing and service of the motion. *See* Local Rule CR 7(d)(3). All dispositive motions shall be noted for consideration no earlier than the fourth Friday following filing and service of the motion.

For electronic filers, all briefs and affidavits in opposition to either a dispositive or non-dispositive motion shall be filed and served not later than 11:59 p.m. on the Monday immediately preceding the date designated for consideration of the motion. If a party files a paper original (i.e., a *pro se* and/or prisoner), that opposition must be received in the Clerk's office by 4:30 p.m. on the Monday preceding the date of consideration. If a party fails to file and serve timely opposition to a motion, the court may deem any opposition to be without merit.

Additionally, the party making the motion may file and serve, not later than 11:59 p.m. (if filing electronically) or 4:30 p.m. (if filing a paper original with the Clerk's office) on the judicial day immediately preceding the date designated for consideration of the

ORDER DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANT AND DIRECTING SERVICE ON REMAINING DEFENDANTS PAGE – 4

motion, a response to the opposing party's briefs and affidavits. 02 No Direct Communications with District Judge or Magistrate Judge. (6) direct communication is to take place with the United States District Judge or Magistrate Judge with regard to this case. All relevant information and papers are to be directed to the 05 Clerk. 06 **(7)** The Clerk of Court is directed to send a copy of this Order to the parties. 07 DATED this 27th day of September, 2007. 08 MMS Casnik 09 Robert S. Lasnik 10 United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 Recommended for entry this 27th day of September, 2007. 16 s/ JAMES P. DONOHUE 17 United States Magistrate Judge 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 ORDER DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANT AND DIRECTING SERVICE ON REMAINING

DEFENDANTS

PAGE – 5